DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 409 560 CS 215 840

AUTHOR Bizzell, Patricia
TITLE Rhetoric and Social Change.
PUB DATE Mar 97
NOTE 41p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (48th, Phoenix, AZ, March 12-15, 1997).
PUB TYPE Opinion Papers (120) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Strategies; *Cultural Context; Discourse Analysis; Higher Education; *Instructional Innovation; Language Role; *Rhetoric; *Social Change; *Student Development; *Writing Instruction; Writing Teachers
IDENTIFIERS Discourse Communities; Public Discourse; *Writing Contexts

ABSTRACT

This paper contends that rhetoric is a force for social change. It also contends that the study of persuasive discourse--how it works, what gives it force--is rhetoric. Pointing out that in the past "persuasive discourse" has meant public discourse of various kinds but that nowadays scholars usually expand the category to include virtually all forms of communication, including letters and diaries, the paper finds that the study of rhetoric, then, may be said to contribute to social change. It argues that writing teachers should reconceive what they do as the teaching of rhetoric, not only of composition. The paper states this may be controversial because the compositionist mode of approaching writing instruction is to offer students an ever-increasing variety of skills and abilities (i.e., writing correctly, organizing logically, adapting sensitively to discourse community conventions). The paper contends that the rhetorical way of approaching instruction in language use may be called holistic; writing skills are put in the service of a larger project--to enable people to be active participants in the discourses of their society. The paper also considers whether the American social context is really in such disarray that any project of identifying significant values and multiple cultural contents for use in persuasion is doomed; illustrates this kind of multicultural persuasive power by analysis of some texts produced by Japanese Americans in response to their internment during World War II; and discusses how to help students develop this kind of persuasive power. (Contains 17 references.) (NKA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
P. Bizzell
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED 409 560

Rhetoric and Social Change

Patricia Bizzell

Conference on College Composition and Communication

Phoenix, March 1997

I contend that persuasive discourse is a force for social change. This should not be a controversial proposition. It is easy to find examples in American history that demonstrate the force of discourse: the struggles in the 18th century to establish the nation itself, in the 19th century to abolish slavery and to increase legal rights for women, in the 20th century to increase civil rights for people of color and for gay people, to name a few. Persuasive discourse, of course, is not the sole force for change in these situations, but it is a powerful component.

The study of persuasive discourse--how it works, what gives it force--is rhetoric. This too should not be a controversial proposition. "Rhetoric" has not always had such a focus during its lengthy history, but I think it's fair to say that this has been its focus most often and that this is the focus most relevant to English studies today. Most often in the past, perhaps, "persuasive discourse" has meant public discourse of various kinds, such as political speeches, courtroom arguments, sermons, and eulogies. Nowadays, in contrast, scholars are

CS215840

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

inclined to expand the category "persuasive discourse" to include virtually all forms of communication, including such "private" texts as diaries and letters and such public but supposedly merely factual texts as scientific journal articles (in addition to a school of literary criticism that studies poetry and fiction as rhetorical texts). Expanding the range of rhetorical analysis in this way is to say that virtually any attempt to communicate in language attempts to make change in the world in some way, to persuade the audience in some way, whether to action or to a new thought or feeling.

The study of rhetoric, then, may be said to contribute to social change. If people learn how better to control persuasive discourse, they can use it better to make the changes in the world that they desire. Indeed, for many rhetoricians through the ages, the purpose of the study of rhetoric has been to equip people to make social change. In remarkably similar terms, for example, classical rhetoricians suggest that persuasive discourse is what makes human society possible, distinguishing us from the rest of the animal creation. Here is Isocrates:

> In the other powers which we possess, . . . we are in no respect superior to other living creatures; nay, we are inferior to many in swiftness and in strength and in other resources; but, because there has been implanted in us the power to persuade each other and to make clear to each other whatever we desire, not only

have we escaped the life of wild beasts, but we have come together and founded cities and made laws and invented arts; and generally speaking, there is no institution devised by man which the power of speech has not helped us to establish. (from Antidosis, quoted in The Rhetorical Tradition, 50)

And Cicero:

Who therefore would not rightly admire this faculty, and deem it his duty to exert himself to the utmost in this field, that by so doing he may surpass men themsevles in that particular respect wherein chiefly men are superior to animals? . . . what other power could have been strong enough either to gather scattered humanity into one place, or to lead it out of its brutish existence in the wilderness up to our present condition of civilization as men and as citizens, or, after the establishment of social communities, to give shape to laws, tribunals, and civic rights? (from Of Oratory, Book I, Chapter VIII, quoted in The Rhetorical Tradition, 204)

And Quintilian:

In truth, the sovereign deity, the parent of all things, the architect of the world, has distinguished

> man from other beings, such at least as were to be mortal, by nothing more than by the faculty of speech. Bodily frames superior in size, in strength, in firmness, in endurance, in activity, we see among dumb creatures . . . The divinity has therefore given us reason, superior to all other qualities, . . . but reason could neither profit us so much nor manifest itself so plainly within us, if we could not express by speech what we have conceived in our minds; a faculty which we see wanting in other animals . . . If, therefore, we have received from the gods nothing more valuable than speech, what can we consider more deserving of cultivation and exercise? (Institutes of Oratory, Book II, Chapter XVI, quoted in The Rhetorical Tradition, 324-325)

The possibly controversial part of my argument comes now: I contend that we writing teachers should reconceive what we do as the teaching of rhetoric, not only of composition. Why should this be controversial? For two reasons, I think. One, because the compositionist mode of approaching writing instruction is to offer students an ever-increasing variety of skills and abilities, such as writing correctly, organizing logically, communicating vividly and sincerely, and adapting sensitively to the conventions of discourse communities, particularly the academic. In fact, we have added so many skills and abilities to our pedagogical repertoire that our national conference has

become quite a loose and baggy monster, difficult to comprehend under the terms of any central theme or cohering project (and if this is true of the meeting where we talk about our work, how much more so may it be true of what goes on in our classrooms).

The rhetorical way of approaching instruction in language use, by contrast, may be called holistic. It's not that the skills and abilities we are teaching now are unimportant in the teaching of rhetoric; indeed, most of them will be regarded as necessary parts of the rhetorician's training. But they are all put in the service of a larger project, which is to enable people to be active participants in the discourses of their society, particularly those discourses most salient in social change. This larger project provides a principle of selection and organization when considering what skills and abilities to help students develop, rather than the merely additive approach that seems to prevail now.

In addition to the distinction between additive and holistic approaches, composition and rhetoric are also distinguished by composition's preference for claiming to present skills and abilities as value-neutral, goal-neutral processes that teachers can simply convey to students, treating the purposes for which they will be used as completely outside the teachers' province. Here we writing teachers mimic, perhaps, the detachment of other academic disciplines. Or perhaps we are circumspect with what we regard as areas of the students'

personal prerogatives. In contrast, rhetoric makes no claims to be value-neutral or goal-neutral. As I have already said, instruction in rhetoric openly aims at the goal of enabling people to be discursive agents for social change. Moreover, rhetorical training cannot be value-neutral. The rhetorical perspective brings into focus the degree to which values and cultural content play a powerful role in communication and persuasion. Therefore, values and cultural content must be addressed in the classroom--they are neither out of bounds nor merely incidental (e.g. to be used as "prompts"), but very much part of the central pedagogical business.

If it is accurate, then, to characterize a compositionist approach to instruction in language use as additive and supposedly value-neutral and goal-neutral, while a rhetorical approach is holistic and focusses on goals and values, why should we prefer the latter over the former? That is just the case I want to address in this paper.

One of my principal objections to the compositionist approach is, as I have implied, that I see the additive attitude toward skills and abilities as incoherent and susceptible to ephemeral or faddish criteria for the choice of methods. Another important objection is that we know from a wealth of scholarship and commentary over at least the past twenty years that compositional skills and abilities are not actually value-neutral or goal-neutral, no matter how much we may claim that they are in

our teaching. For instance, scholars such as Elizabeth Flynn and Miriam Brody have argued that the seemingly value-neutral ability to construct a logical linear argument is in fact a male-inflected activity, more congenial to those who wish to conform to the culture's ideas of what a man should be. If we know that the value-neutral, goal-neutral posture is phony, then, I propose, what we ought to be doing is to devise a new way of looking at our work that acknowledges its evaluative and purposive investments.

I suspect that the biggest objection compositionists would have to adopting the rhetorical perspective I advocate is precisely that it requires looking at goals and values. There is the fear that in looking at goals and values, the teacher will impose his or her own on the students, a fear which has been given considerable attention in the scholarly journals and which I have addressed elsewhere (Bizzell in Downing 1994). Quite apart from that fear, however, there is the question of what values and cultural content should be addressed. Clearly, instruction cannot focus on all the cultures and values in the world. But the question should not be answered acontextually. Teaching should concentrate on the cultures and values that are most significant in the society in which the rhetoricians (both teachers and students) will work.

Deciding what cultures and values are significant is precisely the point at which writing instruction--refigured, as I

am recommending, as rhetoric instruction--becomes "political," that is, deliberately and purposefully as opposed to unconsciously or "inevitably" political (see Herzberg). Much loose talk has circulated in our field over the last few years about the political aspects of our work. A rhetorical perspective would clarify and productively focus this impulse to see what we are doing as political. Becoming political does not mean requiring students to adhere to the instructor's personal political agenda, to vote a certain way, or to pay lip service to certain political views in their writing. Rather, from a rhetorical perspective, becoming political means beginning to make the necessary choices of what values and cultural content will be addressed in the classroom.

The point is that these choices are not made on the basis of the instructor's sole personal preference. Rather, they are guided by what the instructor's scholarly research can tell her or him about the values and cultures that are important in our society. Society, not the instructor, sets the agenda. And if the teacher knows that these choices can be justified only thus, communally, then involving students in making them becomes not just a gesture of good will, but a pedagogical necessity. The students become the front-line representatives of society in the classroom, helping to establish its discursive norms with which they hope to become more fluent, with the aid of the instructor.

If we set ourselves the task of teaching rhetoric, then, attending, as I have argued, to the goals of discursive action and the values and cultural content that can facilitate achievement of these goals, then we will have to examine the nature of the social context. What should the goals of a rhetorician be in the contemporary American social context? What values and cultural content will facilitate achievement of those goals? The short answer to the first of these questions, which I draw--of course--from the American context, can be to foster democracy. The answer to the second of these questions cannot be short, given the multiplicity of the American social fabric, yet it must be explored. And finally, of course, we must ask what actual classroom practices will enable us to address these questions.

The rest of this essay has three parts. In the first, I will consider whether the American social context is really in such disarray, as many commentators have claimed, that any project of identifying significant values and multiple cultural contents for use in persuasion is doomed to failure. Is America truly utterly fragmented and "postcultural," and hence a dwindling reservoir of the cultural elements that facilitate persuasion? I will argue that it is not, but rather, that America increasingly produces people who are internally multicultural, possessing rich, multiple cultural resources and able to manipulate and recombine them creatively and persuasively. Next, I will illustrate this kind of multicultural persuasive power in action by analysis of

some texts produced by Japanese Americans, or Nikkei, in response to their internment during World War II. Finally, I will talk about how to help students develop this kind of persuasive power.

Is American Culture Fragmented?

In an 1846 essay on "American Literature: Its Position at the Present Time, and Its Prospects for the Future," Margaret Fuller realized that defining "American" would have to be a major part of the project she set herself in this essay. Her training and literary predilections, for example her interest in German and Italian literature, which she read in the original languages, equipped her well to avoid the mistake of assuming that American culture could be simply regarded as an offshoot of the British. Rather, she said, we should see ourselves as "a mixed race continually enriched with new blood from other stocks the most unlike that of our first descent" (quoted in Shuffleton 3).

Frank Shuffleton seizes on Fuller's characterization to introduce his edited volume on early American literature because for him, her concept of a "mixed race" highlights the fact that "Despite various attempts to create a myth of ethnic homogeneity before the Revolution, the multiethnic character of America was solidly founded well before that . . . from the moments when John Smith met Powhatan or Hobomok and Squanto stepped out of the forest, . . . American culture has come out of a continuing series of confrontations and collaborations between men and women from every place on the surface of this globe" (14).

While Fuller, and Shuffleton, seem to feel that the "mixed" quality of American culture has been a source of strength, other commentators on the contemporary cultural scene are not so sanguine. Professor of English and social commentator Christopher Clausen goes so far as to describe the United States as "postcultural": he sees the juxtaposition of so many varied cultural elements as destructive of all of them. "This postcultural quality of American life was previsioned as long ago as the 18th century, when universalism was a widely shared ideal and Enlightenment thinkers dismissed any local forces that stood in their way as mere provinciality" (386). Clausen does not deny that the America of those days was multiethnic as Shuffleton describes it, but he contends that the prevailing ideology worked to erase cultural differences as quickly as possible. And, Clausen contends, this ideological effort was successful:

> For all but a tiny proportion of the North American population--Vietnamese or Cuban immigrant families in certain enclaves, religious minorities such as the Old Order Amish or the Lubavitchers, French Canadians in rural districts--the connection with an ancestral culture is now so vestigial that whether to assert or ignore it has become entirely a matter of choice. Taco salad, pizza, stir fry, or a Big Mac? Take your pick. The universal familiarity of these dishes indicates not that many cultures flourish here but that innocuous

> morsels of each are now part of something else, something that is often called American culture--dynamic, inclusive, a melting pot despite the recent unpopularity of that term--but is not a culture at all in the traditional sense of the word. If it were, it would exclude more, and at the same time take more for granted. . . . Apart from the survival (more or less) of the English language, this loss of distinctiveness applies just as much to the WASP-derived American culture of the 19th century as to more recent immigrant cultures from outside Europe. In contrast to societies of the preindustrial past, the contemporary United States has neither one big culture nor a number of smaller ones--only a strange mixture of freedom and nostalgia. (386)

A similar perpsective on cultural disintegration helps Susan Wells to explain the difficulties with what she calls "public writing," or "public discourse," which, following Habermas, she defines as "a complex array of discursive practices, including forms of writing, speech, and media performance, historically situated and contested" (328). Such a definition might be given of almost any form of language use, including writing in a private diary, but it seems to me that the definition she prefers inclines towaard situations in which traditionally "public" rhetorical forms, such as the political speech, would be used. The problem is that the traditional public is no longer there

(if, indeed, it ever was). In describing the barriers to employing public discourse, Wells says:

> The difficulty of constructing a public is not an accident attached to our cloistered academic status. We are not uncertain in our treatment of public writing because we have been sheltered from a vibrant public sphere. Our public sphere is attenuated, fragmented, and colonized: so is everyone else's. All speakers and writers who aspire to intervene in society face the task of constructing a responsive public. Nobody, not even the president speaking on national television, enters it without difficulty (328-329). . . . The cynicism that we encounter daily in our students and ourselves responds to a fragmented and contradictory public, a public that must be constructed and reconstructed, that requires multiple negotiations and positionings for every possible speaker. Cynicism, distrust of politics, even apathy, are neither moral failings nor signs of a romantic (or postmodern) political innocence; they are strategies for addressing a public that no longer supports the illusion of organic integrity. (333)

What are we to do in the face of conditions that almost appear to preclude communication? Clausen, evincing, albeit gently, a bit of that cynicism Wells notes, turns to Whitman:

> "Be not disheartened," Walt Whitman, the prophet of a libertarian America freed from the historic demands of culture, wrote just before the Civil War, "affection shall solve the problems of freedom yet." It would be nice to think so. (388)

Note the sly reference to the Civil War--seeming to discredit Whitman's optimism--and the echo of Hemingway's romantically resigned heros in Clausen's last line. Wells on the other hand, describing her own experience in attempting to enter a public discursive sphere in her neighborhood, says:

> What was keeping us at the block meeting, after all, was not affection, but our common desire for security. (337)

Hence while Clausen seems to see little future for communication beyond solipsism, Wells sees a material basis to keep talking. She calls for "the forms of agreement, the criteria of interdependence, that support particular communicative situations" (337). Presumably these would include, not only a shared understanding of the particular material predicament faced by the people attempting to communicate, but also "criteria" such as "that force not be used to constrain agreement, for example, or that all affected parties speak to a matter being decided" (337). While such criteria do at least allow communication to

continue, in Wells's view it is so constricted and difficult that her preferred image for the scene of exchange is a prison visiting room (335).

Are things really so bad? Clausen, too, uses images of imprisonment. He puts his apocalyptic diagnosis in the service of an argument that deplores the destruction of all standards of behavior and presages evil for individuals "freed by technology from everything but their own personalities" (388). (The essay appears to have been provoked by a New Republic piece by Gary Chapman praising Internet adepts as an "intellectual vanguard" (quoted in clausen, 379).) But if we are to be imprisoned in our personalities, able to contact other people only through a mouthpiece in a plexiglass wall, Clausen does not explain where personalities come from. If people are still here as distinctive personalities, could all culture have disintegrated as he claims? And Wells, I feel sure, would not go along with the apocalyptic tone of Clausen's diagnosis. But if not, then perhaps do we still have more discursive resources than she believes we do?

I am wondering whether we need not be as pessimistic as Clausen, or even as Wells (who begins her essay with a story that seems to me to illustrate a triumph of communication but which she presents as an exemplar of her diminished hopes). In particular it seems to me that we can find writers of color who negotiate the "mixed race" culture these commentators describe with considerable comfort and skill. In America in the 19th

century, for example, slavery was abolished and legal rights were increased for men of color and for women of all races. These social changes were accomplished by a number of forces, in which I think we have to include rhetoric. Celeste Michelle Condit and John Louis Lucaites have argued that African American orators were largely responsible for reinterpreting "all men are created equal" to include all people, as we read the line today--a key ideological shift in bringing about legal reforms. Condit and Lucaites might have added to their analysis other activists of color such as Native American William Apess (see Bizzell 1997). It is not hard to find examples of 19th-century writers who are able to do this kind of rhetorical negotiating.

But do they owe their success to the fact that the culture used to be more homogenous? No one seems to think so. Clausen and Shuffleton have very different feelings about America's status as a land of "mixed race," yet they both trace this condition back at least as far as the 18th century; and Wells appears to have no illusions about what she calls a past "illusion of organic integrity." I contend that they owe it to greater familiarity and ease with the rhetorically "mixed" situation of America, which members of dominant social groups have been able to use their privilege to ignore and hence have cut themselves off from developing the ability to negotiate. Maria Lugones's "Purity, Impurity and Separation" helpfully lays out the theoretical basis for this facility.

Multiple Cultures and Hybrid Discourses

Lugones begins her essay by talking about the two senses in which the verb "to separate" is used in cooking. One sense refers to separating an egg, where what you are trying to do is to divide the yolk and white as cleanly as possible. If any trace of yolk gets into the egg white, the white is tainted and cannot be used. The second sense refers to what happens when you are making an emulsion, such as mayonnaise which combines egg and oil, and the process goes wrong. When the mayonnaise "separates," the egg and oil do not blend completely; but neither do they divide completely. As Lugones says, "you are left with yolky oil and oily yolk." (459) The common term in English for this state of affairs is "curdling"; in Spanish, as Lugones explains, the verb "separar" is always used in both cases so as to highlight with punning complexity the aspects of separation that Lugones wants to discuss.

Lugones's argument is that dominant American ideology tends to think of ethnic identity as separable in the first sense, that is, divided cleanly and completely. This attitude is expressed in the common locution that gives hyphenated designations to people with multiple cultural allegiances, such as Mexican-American, Jewish-American, etc. This kind of separation makes possible social hierarchies that benefit some ethnicities at the expense of others, since it sorts people into clear-cut ethnic categories. This kind of separation also promotes social analyses

that see the multiplication of cultural allegiances as "fragmentation" and bicultural people as internally incoherent.

Lugones challenges this view with the second sense of separation, in which multiple elements are present, not cleanly divided but not smoothly combined either; a single substance, yet multiple. This is the model of bicultural identity she opposes to the prevailing model of fragmentation. She calls it "mestizaje":

> Mestizaje defies control through simultaneously asserting the impure, curdled multiple state and rejecting fragmentation into pure parts. In this play of assertion and rejection, the mestiza is unclassifiable, unmanageable. She has no pure parts to be "had," controlled. (460)

The mestiza is not internally incoherent because her multiple cultural identities are mixed, "curdled." And she is not easily available for exploitation by prejudicial categories because her ethnic identity is not easily assigned.

I want to look more closely at Lugones's analysis of the separated/fragmented self, the view which, she argues, we should reject. Her example is the "mexican/american":

> The anglo imagines each rural mexican/american as having a dual personality: the authentic mexican

> cultural self and the american self. In this notion, there is no hybrid self. The selves are conceptually different, apparently contradictory but complementary; one cannot be found without the other. The anglo philosophy is that mexican/americans should both keep their culture (so as to be different and not full citizens) and assimilate (so as to be exploitable), a position whose contradictoriness is obvious. But as a split dual personality, the authentic mexican can assimilate without ceasing to be "cultured," the two selves complementary, the ornamental nature of the mexican self resolving the contradiction. (470)

Lugones notes that in this duality, while the "american self" is supposed to be "postcultural" (470), the "authentic mexican self" embodies cultural "tradition filtered through anglo eyes for the purposes of ornamentation" (471), ornamentation both in the oppressive sense of being a culture suited only to produce the "formulaic" and currently out-of-use knick-knacks found in "'authentic' mexican craft shops" (471), and in the even more oppressive sense of being an indelible mark on the person that prevents full assimilation by the other half, the american self, no matter how assiduously anglo values are embraced (470).

I think we can see that Clausen speaks from within the perspective that Lugones critiques here. He sees authentic cultural identity only within enclaves that are overdetermined by

race, language, religion, conspicuous dress, etc.--"Cuban immigrant families," "the Lubavitchers." Hence he creates an identity such that the cuban/american, for instance, can be Cuban only at home, within his or her enclave--a choice that Lugones describes as accepting the logic of the separation/fragmentation perspective in this way: "Our communities are rendered private space in the public/private distinction" and so politically ineffective, non-players (471). At the same time, Clausen describes mainstream American society as postcultural. To emerge from one's enclave on his terms, then, can only mean to embrace the other half, the american self, which, because it must pretend to be without culture (in order to match the prevailing ideology that Clausen promulgates), must ignore the injustices perpetrated on the basis of ethnic distinctions.

Clausen seems to feel that America needs a culture that "exclude[s] more, and at the same time take[s] more for granted," although he believes we aren't going to get it. Lugones, on the other hand, calls for Americans to "break the conceptual tie between public space and monoculturally conceived anglo-only concerns: it requires that the language and conceptual framework of the public become hybrid" (471). This is certainly to include, not exclude, more; and to take less for granted (but perhaps Wells's "criteria of interdependence" could help us here).

I want to emphasize that Lugones is not advocating a sort of "parliament of cultures," as I might call it, in which many

different unitary American cultures get a turn to speak. Her most important point, it seems to me, is that the image of a unitary culture, hyphenated with an american self, is wrong. Another way to put this would be to say that she is not talking about a "multicultural" public, if we conceive multicultural in this way, as Clausen has it: "Taco salad, pizza, stir fry, or a Big Mac? Take your pick." Lugones's word "hybrid" is very important. Here is one of her meditations on the issue, playing again on the two senses of the verb "to separate" that she introduced at the beginning:

> Oh, I would entertain the thought of separation as really clean, the two components untouched by each other, unmixed as they would be if I could go away with my own poeple to our land to engage in acts that were cleanly ours! But then I ask myself who my own people are. When I think of my own people, the only people I can think of as my own are transitionals, liminals, border-dwellers, "world"-travelers, beings in the middle of either/or. They are all people whose acts and thoughts curdle-separate. So as soon as I entertain the thought, I realize that separation into clean, tidy things and beings is not possible for me because it would be the death of myself as multiplicitous and a death of community with my own. I understand my split or fragmented possiblities in horror. (469)

In other words, what Lugones wants to endorse is "a multiple subject who is not fragmented" (473), and who is a member of a number of social groups that are themselves "heterogenous" [sic] (475).

Now, what does all this have to do with rhetoric? It seems to me that Lugones can help us in two ways. First, she both describes, and illustrates in her essay, what the "hybrid" discourse for which she calls will be like. She concludes with a brief discussion of what she calls "the art of curdling," that is, discursive arts for expressing the views of subjects who are of "mixed race," multiple but not fragmented. These arts include "Bi- and multilingual experimentation; code-switching; categorical blurring and confusion; caricaturing the selves we are in the worlds of our oppressors, infusing them with ambiguity," and so on (478). It is clear that Lugones sees "curdling" or hybrid discourses as forces for social change, more specifically, for "resistance" (her word) against what she sees as an unjust social order. Moreoever, in her essay, Lugones demonstrates some of these arts, mixing Spanish and English, switching among objective-linear-argument and personal-reflection styles of presenting her ideas, and more. She draws on the ample and various rhetorical resources available to her as a multiply cultured or hybrid person.

Lugones's discussion and illustration of the "art of curdling" helpfully extend what we have learned from Mary Louise

Pratt's concept of the rhetorical "arts of the contact zone" (see Pratt, Bartholomae, Bizzell College English 1994). While Pratt's and Lugones's rhetorical arts are similar stylistically, Pratt's focus might be said to be on the historical and social scenes in which rhetorical exchanges occur, while Lugones focusses on the subjectivities of the participants. What Lugones helps us see is where the resources come from within the rhetorician to practice these arts. Clearly, the multiply cultured person will have an advantage in doing so.

In addition thus to explaining and exemplifying one version of the hybrid discourse that will be most effective now in communicating in multicultural America, Lugones helps us in a second way by providing a comprehensive analysis of the ideologies that influence our conceptions of what it means to be multiply cultured. By naming the separation/fragmentation view, as well as the separation/curdling view, Lugones helps us identify the range of attitudes toward being multiply cultured that we can find in the writing both of those who see themselves as multiply cultured and those who see themselves as monocultural, or postcultural. I have attempted to show how her analysis helps to illuminate what Clausen is doing.

I would now like to apply her concepts to the analysis of two texts by "mixed race" writers who are not from Lugones's particular community. I feel justified in doing so because, it seems to me, what Lugones describes, although obviously inflected

through a culturally specific mestizaje, is broadly applicable in a number of "mixed race" discourses. This is not surprising if we grasp the full import of Lugones's thesis, which would argue that sharp separations--a distinctively different Hispanic rhetoric, African rhetoric, Asian rhetoric, and so on--are unlikely, at least in an American context in which multiple influences have already been at work for so long. As Shuffleton has it, "American culture has come out of a continuing series of confrontations and collaborations between men and women from every place on the surface of this globe."

I think what we will see in these two texts, both responses by Nikkei women writers to their internment during World War II, is a range of attitudes toward being multiply cultured. I will argue that one text, Monica Sone's Nisei Daughter, tends to illustrate hybrid discourse, and a comfortably "curdled" attitude toward being multiply cultured, while Farewell to Manzanar, by Jeanne Wakatsuki Houston and James D. Houston, participates more in the separation/fragmentation point of view. My object here, however, is not to declare Sone the winner in some sort of rhetorical sophistication contest. I believe that both of these texts are powerful. Rather what I want to do is to illustrate the kind of analysis I think we should be doing in our classrooms, and encouraging our students to do, if we want to shift our pedagogical agenda to teaching rhetoric for social change as I have advocated. A range of texts, including texts supplied by the

students, needs to be studied together to make such pedagogy effective.

Two Kinds of Separation in Two Texts on the Internment

Before I begin, I'll provide a bit of background information on the historical situation that gave rise to these texts. In 1942 the United States army removed about 120,000 Nikkei men, women, and children from their homes in West Coast states, with no more than a few days' notice, and detained them in grimy "relocation centers" in desolate areas of the interior. Legal challenges immediately mounted by Nikkei led eventually to Supreme Court decisions that while the removal was legal, given wartime security issues, detention in the camps was not. The camps were then closed, in 1944, but meanwhile the Nikkei had suffered financial losses estimated at from $1.2 to 3.1 billion, in addition to the outrage and humiliation of being subjected to this ordeal solely on the basis of their ethnicity. No evidence was ever presented that any Nikkei aided the Japanese war effort. A government investigation of the internment was finally undertaken in the late 1970s, and as a result of the committee's 1982 report, in 1988 Congress passed a law officially apologizing for the internment and authorizing the payment of $20,000 to each surviving internee.

Both during and after the internment, Nikkei writers responded in a variety of ways. Nikkei lawyers working with the Japanese American Citizens League wrote amicus curiae briefs submitted to the Supreme Court in aid of the legal challenges to the internment. Mike Masaoka and other JACL leaders wrote numerous public pronoucements attesting to their people's loyalty to the United States and counseling compliance with the internment. Later, many people who were interned wrote personal memoirs of their experiences. I will deal here with two of these texts, Monica Sone's Nisei Daughter and Farewell to Manzanar, by Jeanne Wakatsuki Houston and James D. Houston.

It is helpful to know in reading these texts that U.S. immigration law created a situation in the Nikkei community at the time of the internment such that there were two very distinct generations present: the parents' generation, called Issei, who came here from Japan as adults (and who were legally barred from applying for American citizenship), and their children, called Nisei, most of whom were no older than their early 20s, and many much younger, at the time of the internment (they were American citizens by virtue of being born here). Both Nisei, Jeanne Wakatsuki Houston was seven years old when the internment began, and Monica Sone was 22. Most of the Issei were more Japanese than American in culture--for example, many spoke little English--but the Nisei were educated in American schools and were much more culturally "mixed."

It is primarily the Nisei who wrote about the internment in English for an American audience (some Issei wrote accounts in Japanese). This is not surprising when we consider that due to their culturally "mixed" state, the Nisei, on the one hand, would retain such loyalty to the Nikkei community as to want to represent its experiences to a broader American audience in the interests of social justice, and, on the other hand, would possess sufficiently diverse rhetorical resources to communicate with this multiplicitous audience. There is, of course, considerable variation in how individual Nisei writers went about this task. Using concepts from Lugones that I discussed above, I would like to suggest that Sone's account more thoroughly embodies a hybrid discourse, while that of Houston and Houston shows the strong influence of a separation/fragmentation point of view.

Houston and Housteon depict Japanese and American identities as being quite clearly divided, separate from one another. The young Jeanne is described as knowing next to nothing about Japanese culture. In fact, she is so ignorant that she is afraid of Asian faces outside her family. Seated next to a Caucasian girl with "very slanted eyes" on her first day of kindergarten, Jeanne bursts out screaming and has nightmares for weeks (9). A few years later, when her family moves into a Nikkei neighborhood, Jeanne continues to be frightened and repulsed, avoiding the other Nikkei children as much as possible (9-10).

Her lack of knowledge of Japanese is represented by the relative scarcity of Japanese words in the text.

In contrast, Jeanne's parents appear to be the bearers of Japanese culture in the family. Not only do they speak Japanese, but they possess cultural objects and cultural attitudes that are mysteriously inaccessible to Jeanne. We see this separation, for example, in a scene in which Jeanne's father plays the samisen, which the young Jeanne calls derisively the "pinko-pinko," her childish approximation of the sound it makes, and sings a Japanese song that makes him weep, a "mysterious and incomprehensible" reaction in the young Jeanne's eyes (64). These contrasting depictions of parents and children emphasize a separation/fragmentation view of American and Japanese cultures. We are not invited to consider what Japanese elements might be mixed into Jeanne's identity. Rather, these elements are pushed off onto the portraits of the parents, distant from and increasingly irrelevant to the children.

In contrast, Japanese and American cultures are much more mixed in Sone's account. Sone shows no fear of Asian faces, but says that as a small child, she thought such differences as "almond eyes" had no more significance than "like one person's being red-haired and another black" (5). Sone describes her family's apartment as a heterogeneous mixture of American and Japanese elements--mostly Western-style furniture, but with zori slippers under the beds; Japanese books and newspapers, and

National Geographic; a picture of Jesus, and a red silk comforter decorated with Japanese designs; Japanese foods in the kitchen, such as daikon immersed in nuka, but also ham and eggs and pumpkin pies (10-13). Sone attends an American elementary school, but also speaks Japanese with her parents, and at their insistance, attends an afternoon school on Japanese culture. She is not always respectful of what she learns there--in fact, she is often inclined to treat the experience for laughs in her account--but certainly it is not mysterious and incomprehensible to her, the humor perhaps being the best evidence of that easy familiarity. Sone depicts herself as "curdling" with both cultures from an early age, and she draws on both repeatedly in her text, writing in English, but also describing more Japanese objects and attitudes and using more Japanese words than Houston and Houston do.

In Houston and Houston's account, Japanese culture, separated out as it is into the sole possession of the Issei, appears to be destroyed by the internment just as they are. A telling detail concerns the disposition of objects of Japanese culture in the family's possession. Just before the internment, Papa is depicted burning a Japanese flag, in a vain attempt to stave off suspicion (5), and Mama, when the removal has become inevitable, is depicted as smashing on the floor a set of beautiful Japanese dishes that they don't have room to take (10-11). In contrast, Sone emphasizes that although her family was compelled to destroy much, they were also able to entrust some of

their precious Japanese objects to the care of non-Japanese friends for the duration (154-156). We get the feeling that elements of Japanese culture will survive for Sone's family, and moreover, that they will survive in part through the generous aid of other Americans. In Houston and Houston's account, the Wakatsuki family is completely isolated, without non-Japanese friends or any other resources to help them weather the storm.

The narrative core of Houston and Houston's account is the devastating effect that the internment has on Jeanne's father. His livlihood is taken away, he turns to drink, abuses his wife and children, and never recovers either economically or emotionally once the internment is ended. Since he is the principal bearer of Japanese culture in the family, it, too, seems to go down with him. Post-internment, when he belatedly decides to try to infuse some Japanese culture into Jeanne through requiring her to take odori lessons, his efforts are depicted as pathetically ineffectual. Jeanne has already been elected prom queen at her high school, amid a court of all white faces, and that is clearly the direction in which she is going. At the end of the book, when she visits the ruins of Manzanar with her European American husband, one has the feeling that the dusty desolation covers not only the internment camp, but any remaining vestiges of Japanese culture in her life. The denouement vividly illustrates the consequences of the separation/fragmentation perspective as analyzed by Lugones.

In contrast, Sone's account not only maintains the possibility of hybridity, but makes its survival the main focus of the narrative. When Sone first becomes aware of her ethnic identity as a small child, she describes it as an awareness that she has "Japanese blood" (3). This locution, appearing in the very first paragraph of the book and recurring throughout, is very interesting. Normally if a person were to say that he or she had "Japanese blood," or any other kind of blood, people would assume that what was meant was that the person had some ancestors of this particular race--some, not all. Yet Sone uses this locution when she is biologically what would be called a "full-blooded" Japanese. The locution suggests what Sone insists on throughout--that her ethnic identity is multiple.

The narrative core of Nisei Daughter concerns how Sone comes to terms with this multiple identity in the face of American racism, which culminates in the terrible injustice of the internment. From the beginning, Sone's hybrid state is not seen by her as an asset. As a small child, she is upset when she learns that it means she will have to go to two schools, her American elementary school and the Japanese afternoon school (4). Later on, when the family experiences racial prejudice while trying to rent a new apartment, Sone begins to feel that her Japanese blood is a "terrible curse" (118). And with Japan's attack on Pearl Harbor, it becomes the despised "blood of an enemy" (146). At the same time, it is clear that Sone does not entirely identify with the Japanese part of herself. At her

darkest moment, when the internment is announced and she realizes her American citizenship is going to count for nothing, she says:

> I felt like a despised, pathetic two-headed freak, a Japanese and an American, neither of which seemed to be doing me any good. (158-159)

There is still something there in addition to the Japanese. The problem for Sone at this point is that her identity still feels split, fragmented. The image of the two-headed monster recurs through the latter part of the book as she tries to come to terms with the injustices and humiliations of the internment.

In Farewell to Manzanar, the struggle Jeanne faces after the internment is not how to reconcile multiple elements within herself, but rather how to defeat outside forces that would prevent her from assimilating to mainstream American culture, whether these be the prejudiced attitudes of her white classmates or her father's ineffectual attempts to keep her Japanese. A hybrid identity does not seem to be the goal here, but rather one that is free of conflict. Houston and Houston depict Jeanne as achieving assimilation through exploiting the fact that she is sexually attractive to white men. She discovers this strategy as a scantily-clad drum majorette for a Boy Scout drum and bugle corps, and the book ends with her greatest triumph, ascending the throne as the elected prom queen of her high school. Jeanne is depicted as winning this honor by choosing to appear in the

contest parade barefoot, in an off-the-shoulder sarong, with her long hair loose and a flower behind her ear: an "exotic" look, as she describes it (124).

Of course, Houston and Houston do not endorse the teen-age Jeanne's sexual strategy. They are well aware that through it, white culture exploits Jeanne far more than she exploits it, and they even depict the young Jeanne as achieving some insight into this unjust state of affairs. Her prom queen triumph rings hollow on the night of the big dance, and she even admits that her father was right in his disapproval of the revealing costume she wore to win the title (129). But sexual exploitation can happen to any woman. Although Jeanne's experience is racially inflected, being based in her "exotic" appearance to white eyes, still the basic experience is somewhat removed from an ethnic perspective and placed in a more universal one.

Moreover, since the narrative thrust of this story has been to destroy the Japanese elements in Jeanne's surrounding culture, she has nothing with which to supplement the emptiness of the assimilated identity she has achieved. After the war, her older brother Woody visits Japan (the first of the children to do so; Sone's family had gone for an extended visit together when the children were small.) He brings back artefacts--"painted scrolls, lacquered trays"--that sound suspciciously like analogs of those objects Lugones found in "'authentic' mexican craft shops," even though one of them, a sword, "had been in the family for 300

years" (119). Papa is delighted with these objects--naturally, as he is the sole bearer of Japanese culture--but there is little evidence that they make any difference to anyone else.

Sone, on the other hand, resolves her dilemma by coming to realize that "two heads are better than one" (236). Her internal integration process is gradual, involving many elements: her faith in God (186); her realization that Nikkei men's army service will provide a "turning point" for the Nikkei community, "the road back to our rightful places" as citizens (198); her friendship with white families who sponsor her when she leaves the camp to get a job in Chicago and then to go to college in Indiana; the encouragement of her college professors to pursue graduate work in her area of interest, psychology (no surprise there!). Perhaps most important to her, though, is that by achieving a comfortable hybrid identity, she makes her parents happy and remains on good terms with them. She chooses to end her story with the scene in which they give their blessing to her description of herself as possessing "two cultures" (236).

Interestingly, as she leaves the camp and comes to terms with her hybrid identity, the place where Sone is most comfortable, in her own account, is the big city of Chicago. She finds the anonymity of the city liberating (217); or perhaps not exactly the anonymity, but the fluidity of ethnic identity. She does attract some attention because she is Asian, but it is not all negative; for example, she says that she gets waited on in

stores more promptly because the clerks are curious about her. (221) One incident is particularly telling, when she is mistaken on the street for a Chinese fan dancer, Ming Toy. A man addresses her as Miss Toy, and thinking he has said her real name, Miss Itoi, she responds briefly before becoming aware of his mistake and jumping into a taxi to avoid him (220). There are elements both of racial prejudice and of sexual threat in this scene. The man cannot tell the difference between a Chinese and a Japanese (the slur "they all look alike" lurks in the background here), and he seems very easily to associate Asian women with the sex trade (fan dancing being a form of stripping). Yet Sone, instead of dramatizing herself as the victim of exploitation here, maximizes the power the city gives her in this situation to laugh it off and move on.

Thus we see that Sone, taking as her main topic not the internment itself, but her own grappling with a hybrid identity, finally depicts herself as a participant in a living culture, growing and changing. Is she still Japanese? Yes--in a way. Japanese elements are part of the emulsion. But she cannot be categorized or hyphenated in any neat way. In contrast, by focussing on the injustice of the internment, Houston and Houston cast their story into a static mold. The internment was unjust because it destroyed the Japanese elements in Jeanne's culture. But now, they are gone, or in ruins. We do not see current participation in a living hybrid culture as a possibility for her.

Finally I would like to consider what force for social change is exerted by these two narratives. Clearly Houston and Houston want to advocate redress for the internment. Farewell to Manzanar was published in 1973, in the wake of a number of civil rights movements by oppressed American groups and during the period when the government's investigation into the justice of the internment and the possibility of financial redress was heating up. They voice a passionate claim on behalf of the suffering victims of the internment, and vividly describe an injustice that cries out for redress. Shortly after publication, the authors made the book into a television screenplay that was broadcast to wide acclaim. It does not seem far-fetched to speculate that this book may have been one effective force in bringing about the government's eventual acknowledgement of wrongdoing in the internment and provision of financial recompense for the survivors.

Yet the goals aimed at by such a narrative might be described as time-limited (or static, as I said above). Once redress has been granted, the logic of the narrative tends to make everyone feel that the case is closed. In contrast, by choosing to focus on the issue of hybridity, what it is, what its disadvantages and advantages are, Sone guarantees that Nisei Daughter continues to make claims on its readers. We are asked to continue to confront the necessity of accepting hybrid identities in American life. I have found in teaching the two books that

students who see themselves as possessing hybrid identities usually prefer Sone over Houston and Houston. They find Sone's work both more complex and more affirming of their own identity struggles; they see Houston and Houston's monocular focus on injustice as somehow what Lugones would call an "anglo" perspective. Precisely because the comparison is so illuminating, it is important to teach the two books together.

Teaching Hybrid Discourses

I have argued that the study of rhetoric contributes to social change by helping people better to use the persuasive discourses that are powerful in their society. Rhetoric performs this task better than composition because rhetoric's holistic and culture-centered approach is superior to composition's additive and supposedly culture-neutral one. A culture-centered approach, one that focusses on values, goals, and cultural content, not only is possible in late-20th-century America, but it is necessary, for rather than becoming post-cultural, our society proliferates individuals who are comfortably multiply cultured, and skillful users of hybrid discourses. Teaching rhetoric now, then, must mean studying and practicing hybrid discourses.

To that end, Bruce Herzberg and I have published Negotiating Difference: Cultural Case Studies for Composition, and prepared its Teacher's Manual. The reader collects texts brought to the scene of struggle at various moments in American history when

different groups were contending for the power to interpret what was going on. Importantly, each case study illustrates a situation in which rhetoric was effective in making some change for oppressed people. Because the texts were meant to function in what I have called, following Pratt, "contact zones," they are of necessity hybrid, using diverse rhetorical resources from home cultures and mainstream culture. The apparatus in the book and the discussion in the manual all aim to help students and teachers appreciate and emulate the richness of these writers' rhetorical strategies. Please see these publications for further detail.

Works Cited

Bartholomae, David. "The Tidy House: Basic Writing in the American Curriculum." Journal of Basic Writing 12 (Spring 1993): 4-21.

Bizzell, Patricia. "The 4th of July and the 22d of December: The Function of Cultural Archives in Persuasion, as Shown by Frederick Douglass and William Apess." (forthcoming, College Composition and Communication, February 1997).

-------. "Contact Zones and English Studies." College English 56 (February 1994): 163-169.

-------. "The Teacher's Authority: Negotiating Difference in the Classroom." In Changing Classroom Practices: Resources for Literary and Cultural Studies. Ed. David B. Downing. Urbana: NCTE, 1994.

-------, and Bruce Herzberg. Negotiating Difference: Cultural Case Studies for Composition. Boston: Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press, 1996.

-------, and --------. The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present. Boston: Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press, 1990.

Brody, Miriam. Manly Writing: Gender, Rhetoric and the Rise of Composition. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1993.

Clausen, Christopher. "Welcome to Post-Culturalism." The American Scholar (Summer 1996): 379-388.

Condit, Celeste Michelle and John Louis Lucaites. Crafting Equality: America's Anglo-African Word. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.

Flynn, Elizabeth. "Composing as a Woman." College Composition and Communication 39 (December 1988): 423-435.

Herzberg, Bruce. "Composition and the Politics of the Curriculum." In The Politics of Writing Instruction: Postsecondary. Eds. Richard Bullock and John Trimbur. Portsmouth NH: Heinnemann-Boynton/Cook, 1991.

Houston, Jeanne Wakatsuki and James D. Houston. Farewell to Manzanar. 1973; rpt. New York: Bantam, 1974.

Lugones, Maria. "Purity, Impurity, and Separation." Signs 19 (Winter 1994): 458-479.

Pratt, Mary Louise. "Arts of the Contact Zone." Profession 91. New York: MLA, 1991.

Shuffleton, Frank. "Introduction." In A Mixed Race: Ethnicity in Early America. Ed. Frank Shuffleton. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Sone, Monica. Nisei Daughter. 1953; rpt. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1979.

Wells, Susan. "Rogue Cops and Health Care: What Do We Want from Public Writing?" College Composition and Communication 47 (October 1996): 325-341.